

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15-18, 20-25, 27-29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshio et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,952) (hereinafter "Yoshio").

Claims 8, 12, 14 and 26, while objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23, 25 and 27 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-18, 20-29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 45 currently remain pending for consideration.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview**

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15-18, 20-25, 27-29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoshio.

USPTO Examiner Christopher Onuaku is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative and Mr. Nobuhiro Ishizuka of Pioneer Corporation during the telephone interview conducted on May 8, 2007 with regard to this application. Consistent with the discussion at this interview, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims of this application to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of

the instant application's specification. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

During the telephone interview, Applicants' undersigned representative explained an important concept of embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application, namely that different kinds of recording information to be reproduced sequentially are recorded on an information recording medium. The recording information includes recording units that are independent from each other and include any of: 1) video information with associated audio information (e.g., video format information – for example, a movie having video and its associated audio combined together), 2) only audio information, and 3) data information.

Fig. 10 of the instant application, for example, illustrates a data information output Sdu, a video information output Sdv, and an audio information output Sda. The specification describes, at page 65, lines 10-13, for example, that this "data information" is data information for being output to an external computer or the like. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that this might be a web-page address, for example, that can be read by the computer.

Applicants' undersigned representative went on to explain that such an arrangement allows a user to create a type of multimedia display of their chosen types of recording information. Also recorded is at least one integrated reproduction procedure information indicating a reproducing procedure to sequentially reproduce two or more of these types of recording information. The final "wherein" clause of claim 1, for example, further describes that these two or more types of recording information that are to be sequentially reproduced include at least the data information for being read by a computer. As a result, a user can, for example,

choose to display video format information (such as a performance by a musician including video and it's associated audio) or audio information (such as only the audio of a musician's performance) and then follow up the display of that video format information or audio information with data information for being read by a computer (for example, a website address to link a viewer to an Internet website of the musician).

During the interview, Applicants' undersigned representative explained how the applied Yoshio reference only discloses a simultaneous reproduction of its video information, audio information and sub-picture information, but it does not disclose a "sequential" reproduction of these types of information. It appears that the Examiner had previously agreed with this distinction at page 4, lines 8-13 of a previous Office Action dated October 6, 2005. At this portion of the October 6, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner noted that Yoshio fails to disclose "indicating a reproducing procedure to sequentially reproduce two or more recording information ..."

However, during the telephone interview, the Examiner referred to col. 13, lines 40-67 of Yoshio for a disclosure of a "reproduction order" of programs 60 for a teaching of this "sequential" feature. Applicants' undersigned representative responded that this portion of Yoshio merely discloses a reproduction order of video format information pieces, but it does not teach, or even suggest, a user being able to set up a reproduction order of two or more different types of recording information, each recorded in a respective format, and these two or more types of recording information including at least data information for being read by a computer.

A further discussion of col. 18, lines 15-34 of Yoshio was conducted during the telephone interview. Applicants' undersigned representative explained how this portion of Yoshio

describes that an audio sub stream 302 and a sub picture stream 303 are reproduced in combination with a video stream 301. Thus, even assuming, strictly arguendo that this “sub-picture information” might be interpreted as data information (which Applicants do not concede to because of the above discussion of the “data information for being read by a computer”), this portion of Yoshio teaches the simultaneous reproduction of video, audio and sub-picture information, not a sequential reproduction of these information types. Nevertheless, Applicants also explained during the interview that Yoshio merely describes video, audio and sub-picture information that are all parts of a standard video format. However, there is no teaching in Yoshio of a sequential display of different kinds of recording information that are each recorded in a respective format.

Examiner Onuaku expressed an understanding during the telephone interview that these features of embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application are different from the arrangements disclosed in Yoshio. However, the Examiner noted that each of the independent claims should be amended to more particularly describe these features.

Accordingly, consistent with the discussion during the telephone interview, Applicants have amended independent claim 1, and each of the remaining independent claims, to refer to advantageous features in that “said different kinds of recording information, which is recording units independent of each other, and each recorded in a respective format, to be reproduced by the integrated reproducing procedure information, comprises any of video information with associated audio information, only audio information, and data information for being read by a computer.” These specific amendments were discussed with the Examiner during the telephone

interview and the Examiner expressed at least an initial agreement that they described features that distinguished from Yoshio.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Yoshio does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23, 25 and 27, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23, 25 or 27, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 8, 12, 14 and 26, while objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8, 12, 14 and 26 are also allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 7, 11, 13 and 25, respectively. Withdrawal of the objections to claims 8, 12, 14 and 26 are thus respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

Dated: May 16, 2007

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

**Customer No. 055694**  
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005-1209  
Tel.: (202) 842-8800  
Fax: (202) 842-8465